

### REMARKS

Claims 1-11 were presented for examination, are pending and are rejected.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

#### The 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-11 are rejected as being indefinite.

The antecedent basis errors of claims 1 and 11 have been corrected. Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

#### The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10 and 11 are rejected as being unpatentable over Britz in view of Tsujimoto.

Claim 5 has been indicated as allowable. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the limitations of claim 5. Claims 2, 6 and 10 depend from claim 1. Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 7 and 8 are rejected as being unpatentable over Britz and Tsujimoto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Izadpanah.

Claim 3 has been canceled. Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1, which should be allowable as discussed above. Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 is rejected as being unpatentable over Britz, Tsujimoto and Izadpanah as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Puc.

Claim 4 has been canceled. Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected as being unpatentable over Britz and Tsujimoto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Haven.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1, which should be allowable as discussed above. Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter


Claim 5 is objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusions

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance based on claims 1, 2 and 6-11 in view of the amendments thereto and the foregoing comments.

If any impediments remain to prompt allowance of the case, please contact the undersigned at 808-875-0012.

Respectfully submitted,



---

John P. Wooldridge  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,725

Dated: February 26, 2007